



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mr. Nulty's way; and so Mr. Nulty chose his thirty men, and Pat and Jem among them. And when he got on his horse, he says—

"Now, boys, handle yourselves, and let me see what you'll do, for men are getting mighty scarce in this country; and they will be scarcer yet than ever they were; and we will have to take to the English fashion before long, and every man will have to learn to do double work for double wages, all the year round; and the sooner the better; for that will be better in the end for both master and man."

So he rode off, and his men after him, as fast as they could; and more farmers came in, and wages rose to two shillings; and old Mr. Barnes waited to the last, and had to give two shillings, and got the worst men in the place, and men that would not even be as willing for him as for another.

So Pat and Jem started together, for they had a mile to walk.

"And sure enough," says Jem, "the boys are getting mighty scarce, where there once was plenty; I wonder did the like ever happen in the world before?"

"Well, now," says Pat, "I mind our Saviour Jesus Christ speaking of the labourers being mighty scarce in harvest when he was upon earth."

"Well, I mind that, too," says Jem, "for I read about it; and now I wonder," says he, "what that meant; he said, sure enough, there was a great harvest, and not half people to reap it. And was it the oats he was meaning? For ever since that day we were talking about the stone, and the praty, and the hen, I'm still thinking, when our Saviour talked of the like of them things, he was meaning something else that we ought to learn, and just taking a plain way to teach us."

"Well, I believe that's true, surely," said Pat; "but what could he mean about the harvest, and nobody to cut it?"

"I mind now," says Jem, "that I read that the harvest is the end of the world, and the angels are the reapers. But how could that be, that there were no labourers? Sure it can't mean that God has not angels enough to do what he wanted."

"It couldn't be that," said Pat; "but what can it be?"

So they turned it every way, and could make nothing of the harvest that wanted hands to cut it. And by this time they were at Mr. Nulty's field, for they walked fast.

"So," says Pat, "I wish I had my Bible with me, and we would try and make it out at dinner time."

"Well I have mine," said Jem, "for it is small and handy, and fits in my pocket, so we will try it at dinner time."

And so they turned to, and did their best for Mr. Nulty. And as soon as they got through their dinner, Jem took out his Bible, and they began to look for it.

"I have it here," said Jem, "it's the last two verses of the 9th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel;" and so he read—"Then saith he unto his disciples, the harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest."

"Now try," said Pat, "and find out where he was, and what he was doing, and then maybe we will see the meaning."

So Jem looked back a bit in the chapter. "I have that too," said Jem; "he was preaching the Gospel (v. 35), and when he saw the great crowd of people he had compassion on them, because he saw they were like sheep that had no one to look after them; and then he said it was a fine harvest, only the labourers was very few."

"Surely, then," said Pat, "the people was the harvest. But who were the labourers?"

"Stay now," said Jem, "I see a mark in the side of the page to look to St. Luke (chap. x. ver. 1, 2). And there they found that our Lord sent seventy of his disciples to go before him into every city, and tell the people about the kingdom of God (v. 9); and then he said to them, 'the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few.'"

"I see it now," said Pat, "the labourers were them that were to tell the people about Christ, and the kingdom of God. Sure isn't it all plain now? isn't there plenty of people in this field that knows as little about Christ as we did before we took to the reading; and maybe if any one would take the trouble to teach them, they would be as glad as ourselves to learn, for sure there is a deal of the boys that's not satisfied with Father John's ways, and that would be willing to learn better: and wouldn't that be the fine harvest? And isn't it the harvest that's losing for want of men to save it?"

"Well, if that isn't true," said Jem; "but where's the labourers? I wonder how it would be if the readers that I hear is about Ballycarny, was to come down this way and try the people here? but sure enough that sort of labourers is few."

"Deed and I think there is many would listen to them ready enough," said Pat, "if they came in to their houses, in a quiet way, of an evening."

"And couldn't we get some of the neighbours to read with ourselves of an evening?" said Jem.

"Why, then, I think we might, easy enough," said Pat, "and a good thing it would be; but, then, wouldn't Father John soon come to hear of that, and wouldn't he destroy us entirely? Why, even Mr. Nulty would hardly dare to employ us, if Father John was to give orders against it on the altar."

"Why, then," said Jem, "if the biggest thistle in Ireland was standing for'nint me to-day, I wouldn't stop reaping for fear of prickling my fingers. And if ever we put our hand to Christ's harvest, we will have to face the thistles too; and if we go on reading ourselves, it will come to that sooner or later; and maybe, as Mr. Nulty says of double work, the sooner the better."

"Ay," said Pat, "there's a verse that troubles me often of late, where our Saviour says, that if we are ashamed of him before men, he will be ashamed of us before the angels of God; and, sure, that should make us face thistles and all. But do you think," says Pat, "that we will ever see such a harvest of people in Ireland?"

"It's my opinion," said Jem, "its coming fast; and, if the readers come down this way, you'll see."

So the bell rung, and they were off to their work; and when evening came, Mr. Nulty paid them two shillings and twopence a man, for he always gave the height of the wages, and a little more; and very thankful his men were, and so was Mr. Nulty, for not a man in the parish had his reaping as cheap by the acre that day.

WHAT SCRIPTURE TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Our readers are familiar with the place which the Blessed Virgin occupies in the theological system of the Church of Rome. She is described as "the gate of heaven," "the queen of angels," "the star of the morning." The late Pope Gregory XVI. declares, that in the midst of the greatest calamities he ever recognised her as his patroness and protectress; that she is our only confidence—nay, the entire ground of our hope; the mother, sovereign, guide, mistress of all men. Or, to quote a still later document—"True Catholics," says the Cardinal de Bonald, "pray no longer, in some sort, to Jesus, except through Mary. For them there are no festivals without her; we might say, that apart from her there is no more hope for them. Her name is found incessantly on their lips, and her image in all their hearts. The church, far from opposing, applauds these bursts of filial piety. From his tempest-tossed bark Peter turns his looks constantly to the star of the sea. It seems that God has given over his omnipotence to his mother." And if our readers call to their recollection the pastoral letters of the present Roman Catholic bishops to their flocks, they will see that the cardinal's statement is perfectly true—"Her name is found incessantly on their lips." We believe that it is impossible to find any such document, of moderate length, in which the Blessed Virgin's name is not mentioned; scarcely one of which a considerable portion is not occupied with expressions of devotion to her, and exhortations to their people to love and reverence her.

Now, we propose to enable our readers to judge whether the Blessed Virgin occupied the same place in the thoughts of the primitive Christians which she holds in the teaching of the Church of Rome. We begin with the writings of our Lord's Apostles and evangelists, as they are recorded in the Holy Scriptures. "No doubt," a Roman Catholic will suppose, "the writings of the Apostles cannot fail to contain innumerable expressions of their ardent love and devotion to the mother of God; no doubt, in their letters to their flocks, they must repeatedly have taught them the advantages and importance of addressing their prayers to her who is 'our only hope, and of securing her intercession with her Son.'" Well, we shall not take upon ourselves to say that there is no such thing in the Bible; but we shall put our readers in a position to judge for themselves. We print from the Douay Testament every passage in which the Blessed Virgin's name is mentioned, after the first accounts in the gospel of the particulars of our Saviour's birth, and we leave it to the reader to say whether the Apostles entertained the same sentiments, with regard to the Blessed Virgin, which are held by modern Romanists, by Gregory XVI., or the Cardinal de Bonald.

If we have inadvertently omitted any passage in the New Testament in which her name is mentioned, we shall be happy to print it in our next number, if any of our readers will point out to us our omission. We believe, however, that our list is complete.

We recommend our readers to begin by reading over the accounts of our Saviour's incarnation and birth, given in the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in the first two of St. Luke's Gospel. It would take up too much space to reprint these chapters here; but any one who reads these chapters (which contain

the history of the Virgin, during the early part of our Lord's life), together with the passages we give (which contain all that is told of her afterwards), will, we believe, have read all that Scripture records or teaches concerning her.

Matthew xii. 46, &c. "As Jesus was yet speaking to the multitude, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him. And one said to him: Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee. But he answering him that told him, said: Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And stretching forth his hand towards his disciples, he said: Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father that is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

The same story is given, nearly in the same words, Mark iii. 31, Luke viii. 19.

Matthew xiii. 54 tells us that the people who heard our Lord's teaching wondered, and said—"How came this man by this wisdom and these mighty words? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath he all these things?"

See also Mark vi. 3, and John vi. 42. "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?"

Luke xi. 27. "As Jesus spoke these things a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to him: Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps that gave thee suck. But he said: Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the Word of God, and keep it."

John ii. 1. "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee: and the mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus also was invited and his disciples to the marriage. And the wine failing, the mother of Jesus saith to him: They have no wine. And Jesus saith to her: Woman, what is it to me and to thee? my time is not yet come. His mother saith to the waiters: Whatsoever he shall say to you do ye. Now there were set there six water-pots of stone, according to the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three measures apiece. Jesus saith to them: Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And Jesus saith to them: Draw out now and carry to the chief steward of the feast. And they carried it. And when the chief steward had tasted the water made wine and knew not whence it was, but the waiters knew who had drawn the water, the chief steward called the bridegroom, and saith to him: Every man at first setteth forth good wine, and when men have well drank then that which is worse. But thou hast kept the good wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee: and he manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him. And after this he went down to Caphernaum, he and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples; and they remained there not many days."

John xix. 25. "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing whom he loved, he saith to his mother: Woman, behold thy son. After that he saith to the disciple: Behold thy mother. And from that hour the disciple took her to his own."

These are the only passages which we can find in the Gospels relating to our Lord's mother. The book of the Acts of the Apostles contains all that is known of the history of the Christian Church, for about thirty years after the crucifixion. In this book the only mention we can find of the Blessed Virgin is—

Acts i. 14. "All these [viz., the Apostles] continued with one accord in prayer with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."

The Douay Testament contains fourteen letters written by the Apostle Paul—viz., one to the Church of Rome, two to that of Corinth, one to the Churches of Galatia, one to the Church of Ephesus, one to that of Philippi, one to that of Colossa, two to the Church of the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon, and one to the Hebrews. *In all these fourteen letters we have not been able to discover a single mention or allusion to the Blessed Virgin.*

We find next in the Testament the Catholic Epistle of St. James the Apostle. But neither does he make, the least mention of the Virgin.

There next occur two Epistles by St. Peter; but this great Apostle not only gives no injunctions to invoke the Virgin Mary, but he does not once mention nor allude to her.

The Testament next contains three Epistles written by St. John the Apostle, to whose special care our Lord had committed his mother: but this Apostle is as silent with respect to her as the rest.

There is also an epistle written by the Apostle Jude, and in this, too, there is not a word concerning the Virgin.

The Roman Catholic must find it singular that in twenty-one letters, some of them long ones, containing all that the providence of God has allowed to be transmitted to us of the instructions given by the Apostles to their flocks, there should be no instructions to invoke

* As Pathad not his Douay Bible at hand, we have compared all the verses in the two Bibles, and find the sense and meaning the same, only there is a little difference in some of the words.

the Blessed Virgin—nay, no mention of the name of her who is now described as the only refuge of sinners. The last book of the New Testament is the Apocalypse, supposed to have been written by the Apostle St. John, at the close of his life, and in which we ought to expect to find anything necessary to be believed and practised which had not been recorded in the previous part of the canon of Scripture. In this book, however, we are equally unable to find any mention of the Blessed Virgin.

We have now laid before our readers everything we can find in Scripture on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. We make no comment on these passages, but invite our readers to compare them for themselves with the teaching of the Church of Rome on the same subject. On a future occasion we may, perhaps, give an account, in like manner, of the doctrine of the Fathers of the first three centuries with regard to her.

INFALLIBILITY.

In the early numbers of this paper we reprinted in full an essay on this subject by the present Archbishop of Dublin, and stated our intention of giving the reply in a future number. The press of correspondence and other original matter has hitherto obliged us to postpone that reply, for which (as we have already done) we beg again to apologize to our readers, and proceed now to perform our promise, by giving them, in a condensed form, the substance of by far the ablest answer which has come to our notice—that of the Rev. Patrick Murray, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth.*

We think it very satisfactory that an answer to Dr. Whately should have been undertaken by a gentleman of acknowledged ability, and holding so high an official position as an accredited teacher in the church; and we cannot but commend the temperate and courteous tone in which it is written, as well as the tact and ability of the writer. Whether he has succeeded in proving what he professes to have shown—viz., that the Archbishop “has completely failed in his argument against the doctrine of infallibility”—we must leave to our readers to judge, after perusing the arguments which we now lay before them; or, what would be still better, the original essays themselves, which we would strongly recommend to every one interested in this important controversy.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S ARGUMENT.

Such of our readers as are in possession of his grace's essay (for which see our first and second numbers), will remember that its leading argument is substantially as follows:—

St. Paul, in his farewell address to the elders of Ephesus and Miletus (Acts xx. 29-31), gives them a very solemn warning (repeated in several of his epistles), that after his departure false teachers should arise, and even from among themselves (from the bosom of their own Church), who should teach perverted doctrines to draw away the disciples after them, against whom he calls on them to *watch*, and to remember that, by the space of three years, he ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears.

If we had not these accounts in the Bible, the archbishop observes, that it might seem incredible that any such thing should have taken place, or that false teachers should have been permitted to gain a hearing, or have been able to draw away the disciples from the faith; and we might have been disheartened, and felt as if God had forsaken his Church, in leaving Christians to find their safety against such false teachers in watchful, careful, and honest examination of every doctrine taught; but from these passages we see, that from the very first, this care and watchfulness were indispensably necessary to guard against the danger of

false teachers introducing corruptions of the true Gospel; and that, even then, Christians were required to be on their guard against the grievous wolves in sheep's clothing who would enter in, not sparing the flock. “But how does St. Paul,” continues the archbishop, “tell his hearers to provide against this danger?

“Does he promise them that the primitive or early Church shall be safe from it? that no inroads of error will take place for the first three or four hundred years?

“Or does he tell them that they will find their safety in *apostolical succession*? that it is miraculously provided that no teacher shall ever mislead them, who has but been regularly ordained by himself, or by those appointed by him to succeed him in the office of ordaining?

“Or, does he tell them that when any point of doubt and difficulty arises, they are to find safety in applying to Peter and to those who shall be divinely appointed from time to time as his successors and representatives, for decisions and directions that cannot be wrong? Not a word is said of any Apostle but himself: or of any one who should succeed him in the apostolic office. To himself, during his life, they would naturally apply by letter, if opportunity offered, for directions in any case of doubt that might arise. But not even any Apostle—much less any successor of an Apostle—is mentioned by Paul as the infallible guide, whom, after his own death, they were to consult.

“Or, does he bid them resort to some central Church—whether at Jerusalem, or at Rome, or at Byzantium—and seek there for infallible guidance?

“Or, does he direct them to summon a general council, or assembly of all Christians, and refer every question that may arise to the decision of a majority of its votes; with a full assurance that these should be so supernaturally overruled by the Holy Spirit as to secure them from the possibility of mistake?

“No: he makes no allusion whatever to any other Church or prelate; to any successor of Peter or of the other Apostles; or to any infallible council, as their guide. But he tells them to *TAKE HEED TO THEMSELVES*, and to the flock they are set over; he tells them to *'watch'*; and he exhorts them to remember his own earnest warnings to them.

“Now, if there had been provided by the Most High any such safeguard as had been alluded to—if Paul had known of any order of men, any bishop or archbishop, any particular Church, or general council, designed by Providence as an infallible guide, and a sure remedy against errors and corruptions, would he not have been sure, on such an occasion as this, to give notice of it? If, when he foresaw the peril of the Church, like that of a ship in a dangerous storm, he had known of a safe port, just at hand, and easily entered, is it to be believed that he would have never alluded to it, but have left his hearers exposed to the storms? Would he have been, in that case, ‘pure’—as he declares he was—‘from the blood of all men?’ Can any one seriously think, that against the dangers which he had been warning them of, and weeping over, for three years, he knew of a complete safeguard, and yet was so wanting in his duty—so careless of their well-being—as never to make the slightest mention of anything of the kind? To suppose this would be to suppose him destitute not only of all faithfulness in his high office, but of common prudence and good sense. And yet, if any such provision really had been made by the author of our faith, it is utterly inconceivable that the Apostle Paul should have been—and that, too, on such an occasion as this—left in utter ignorance of its existence.

“Whatever may be the precise meaning of our Lord's promise—‘Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,’—it is, at least, perfectly clear what it could not mean; it could not relate to anything either unknown to Paul, or kept back by him from his hearers. All that he knew, and that it was for their benefit to learn, he had, as he solemnly declares, taught to them, and this was no less than the whole counsel and design of God. ‘I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears.’ From all this we may learn, among other things, how great is the mistake of those who are satisfied that they can trace up to a very early period—to what they call the primitive Church—some doctrine or practice not found in God's holy Word; and they consider this as showing God's approbation of what may have been, after all, one of the ‘perverse things’ introduced by false teachers, and against which Paul so earnestly warned the elders.”

The archbishop then proceeds to observe “that the exposure of Christians to those dangers, and the call upon them, both ministers and laity, for the continued exercise of watchful caution, is far from appearing to be

either what we would wish, or what we would think probable in a revelation from God. It is opposed both to men's feelings and to their expectations.

“To examine again and again—to think and consider—to hesitate and to make up one's mind cautiously—to be always ready to hear anything fair that can be said—and to acknowledge that, after all, we may be mistaken; all this is, on many accounts, contrary to men's natural inclinations. Some have no confidence in their own judgment, and are, therefore, afraid of being left in any way to its guidance; some are so proud that they cannot bear to acknowledge themselves in doubt or uncertainty; some are so indolent, that they do not like the trouble of thinking and deciding; some wish to escape the anxious cares connected with such a state, and cannot bear to be in the least degree of uncertainty. And hence there is a strong prejudice or feeling beforehand, in favour of any system which promises to put an end to the work of inquiry at once and for ever, and to relieve us from all embarrassing doubt and uncomfortable self-distrust. And this is done, either by setting forth the authority of an infallible church, which is to mark out, on every point, what we are to believe and to do; thus relieving us from all trouble and anxiety, and from all necessity of acting on the Apostle's warning to ‘take heed to ourselves’: or, again, by putting in place of such a church *immediate inspiration* from heaven, whether bestowed on each individual who belongs to a certain sect or party, or on some highly-gifted leader, who will communicate to his followers the message he receives from heaven. Widely different, in many points, as these sects, and parties, and churches are from each other, they all agree in the one fundamental point just noticed. They all address themselves to that powerful principle in human nature already noticed, the *craving for infallibility* in religious matters.

“It is true, that hardly any one is found who in words claims or expects to be personally infallible; still we may truly say, that there is in human nature a craving for infallibility, which inclines men beforehand to receive the pretensions, either of a supposed infallible church, or of those who claim or who promise immediate inspiration. Accordingly, some persons waver for a time between these two kinds of pretensions, and at last give in to the one or the other. Again, you may find persons changing from the one to the other, and sometimes thus changing more than once: and it might be added, that one may find instances of the same individual, himself unchanged, exposed to severe blame at different times, not only from different persons, but even from the same; first, for refusing to join the one party, and afterwards for refusing to join the other most opposed to it; both parties, much as they are opposed to each other, still always clinging to the confident expectation of finding that infallibility above spoken of. They are *inquiring* only after a way of freeing themselves from the trouble of all further inquiry. Their *care* is only to relieve themselves, in the end, from all further need of watchful care. They are like men in a ship, searching for a perfectly safe harbour, in which the helm may be abandoned, and the ship left to ride securely, without any need of watching the winds and currents, and of looking out for rocks and shoals. They hope to obtain, in all ages of the Church, that freedom from all need of watchful circumspection, which was not granted even in the ages of the Apostles; for we find that, even when there were these infallible guides on earth, Christians are perpetually warned of the danger of mistaking ‘false apostles’ for true.”

DR. MURRAY'S ARGUMENT.

After some preliminary remarks, and referring to Archbishop Whately's observations upon the craving for infallibility in religious matters as a powerful principle in human nature, and to the Protestant doctrine of the all-sufficiency of Scripture as the sole rule of faith, containing all that is necessary to be believed or followed to make men wise unto salvation, Dr. Murray proceeds thus:—

“Now, if this theory of the sufficiency of Scripture be true, and if the temptation to admit an infallible authority be such as Dr. Whately describes it, then no light presumption would exist that a specific admonition against a danger so imminent—so deeply rooted in human nature—so peculiarly, because of its own nature, permanently, and incurably, fatal to sound doctrine—would have been given by our Lord or his Apostles, and would have been pretty clearly recorded in Scripture. The presumption becomes infinitely stronger when we consider that there is a number of passages in both the Old and New Testaments, which (I take for granted Dr. Whately would admit) seem, at first sight, to imply something very like what we call infallibility. Such are those texts of the prophecies in which the Church of the New Law is represented as for ever so pure and glorious, ever finally triumphant over all her enemies, ever beloved of God and protected by him. Still more distinct and emphatic are the passages of the New Testament, wherein it is said that the invisible enemies of the Church should never prevail against her (Matt. xvi. 18); where our Lord promises to be with his Church

* Published by Gerald Bellw, 79, Grafton-street; Dublin, 1852: in the third volume of a series of essays, chiefly theological, originally entitled the Irish Annual Miscellany.

It was our intention to have reprinted this essay *verbatim*, as we had done that of Archbishop Whately; but on application for permission to do so, were referred by Dr. Murray to his publisher, Mr. Bellw, who refused such permission in terms less courteous than we should have expected, giving us, at the same time, unlimited power to abuse Dr. Murray's essay (which, we suppose, was without Dr. Murray's authority, and are not likely to avail ourselves of), and cautioning us against giving, even by way of extract, more than one-fourth of the essay in question. It is not, therefore, our fault, which we hope our readers will observe, that we do not give the *whole* of Dr. Murray's reply in his own words.